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Introduction & Background

The Global Platform for Sustainable Natural Rubber is an international, Multi-Stakeholder, voluntary membership initiative seeking to lead improvements in the socioeconomic and environmental performance of the natural rubber value chain. Development of the GPSNR was initiated by the CEOs of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) Tire Industry Project (TIP) in 2018. Members of the platform include tire manufacturers, rubber suppliers and processors, vehicle makers and NGOs. Representatives from each of these stakeholder groups have contributed to the development of the Singapore-based platform and the wide-reaching set of priorities that will define strategy and objectives.

Through GPSNR’s Working Groups and the Executive Committee, the Platform is developing an Assurance Model that is intended to be credible and smoothly functioning. Underlying this Assurance Model, and to ensure its effective implementation, is the need for a mechanism by which Members and non-members may take grievances they have against a Member for non-conformance with the Platform’s requirements, which may arise from non-conformance with standards, the Code of Conduct, Conflict of Interest Policy, or other requirements of Members and allow those complainants to have their grievance be heard and resolved (“Grievance Mechanism”).

Under its authority and duty to create a Compliance System for the Platform under Section 10.d. of the Platform’s statutes, the Executive Committee seeks recommendations on the organization and process for such a Grievance Mechanism that allows for the intake, an initial, professionally mediated resolution process, and, finally, the process by which it is submitted to a formal Complaints Panel for resolution in the case that mediation does not
work. That recommendation would be in accordance with the engagement outline below and based on a comparative study of best practices in grievance mechanisms for similar multi-stakeholder initiatives. Understanding that the Platform is in its early stages, and therefore has limited resources, the recommendation should strive for a lean model while maintaining consistency with the policies of the Platform (e.g., Conflict of Interest Policy). Although lean, the Platform also recognizes the need for a process that is accessible, impartial, timely, transparent, and affords protections, such as anonymity, to the complainant (where needed). Developing the Grievance Mechanism is expected to be an iterative process.
The Engagement

The consultant is to develop, in consultation with the GPSNR Executive Committee and Secretariat, a Grievance Mechanism in the form of a process flowchart and a set of rules governing the process for receiving, assessing, processing, and escalating grievances through a series of steps to find an agreeable and just solution. The consultant should adhere to the following phased, iterative approach:

Phase I – Comparative Review of Grievance Mechanisms for Similar Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives

- A review of the aspects of credible grievance mechanisms to underscore why the proposed process is being recommended, as outlined in:
  - ISEAL’s work on grievance mechanisms for GPSNR (Attachment A)
  - The United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Attachment B)
  - Other “best practice” recommendations

The Comparative Review shall be presented in a form that can be distributed to the GPSNR Secretariat and Executive Committee for review and discussion among the consultant, Secretariat, and Executive Committee.

The purpose of the comparative study is to provide the GPSNR Secretariat and Executive Committee with recommendations for developing a Grievance Mechanism. The study as well as subsequent recommendations should take into consideration: the need for a lean process operated with limited

GPSNR-RFP-A02-003
resources, in the short-term; input from the GPSNR EC and Secretariat on needs as well as likely assurance models the platform will be utilizing; the potential for bottlenecks or other process issues to arise in various mechanisms and how to mitigate those to ensure timeliness of resolution; and a means to understand the rationale for the process flowchart or outline developed in Phase II.

**Phase II – Process Flowchart/Outline**

- A process flowchart or outline providing a high-level description of the Grievance Mechanism process, from in-take of the complaint through resolution, if a resolution can be agreed upon.

- The flowchart or outline shall take into consideration the contemporaneous development of the Platform's Assurance Model and should conform with the Assurance Model's aspects and requirements. This may require discussions or touchpoints with the consultant developing the Assurance Model.

- The flowchart or outline shall be presented in a form that can be distributed to the GPSNR Secretariat and Executive Committee for review and discussion among the consultant, Secretariat, and Executive Committee.

- The purpose of the flowchart or outline is to provide a high-level recommendation for the Grievance Mechanism for GPSNR, taking into consideration the need for a lean process operated with limited resources, and for the GPSNR Secretariat and Executive Committee to provide feedback to the consultant for development of the final deliverable under Phase III.
**Phase III – Final Recommendation**

- A final recommendation for the structure and process of the Grievance Mechanism that includes a detailed set of rules governing the process from in-take of the grievance through resolution. In addition, the recommendation should include a process flowchart that provides a high-level overview of the Grievance Mechanism process, based on final feedback from stakeholders and the GPSNR EC following Phase II.

- The final recommendation shall be sent to stakeholders for feedback over the course of a 30-day period. These pieces of feedback shall be shared with the EC with recommendations on how to respond.

- The final recommendation shall be consistent with the aspects and requirements of the Assurance Model that is being contemporaneously developed and approved. Although final approval of the Assurance Model will be made by the General Assembly on March 30 or 31, 2020, the consultant will have access to the version of the Assurance Model, as approved by the Executive Committee in January 2020, and to the consultant developing the Assurance Model.

- The final recommendation shall reflect a lean process operated with limited resources, but with the potential to scale, and shall provide accessibility, impartiality, timeliness, transparency, and protections for the complainant (e.g., anonymity).
Terms

The engagement shall begin January 10, 2019 and the various Phases shall be completed in accordance with the dates outlined in the “RFP & PROJECT TIMELINE” section below.

The consultant should have a deep understanding and documented experience in:

- Engaging and coordinating within a multi-stakeholder framework.
- Working in and engaging with grievance mechanisms. Strong preference will be given to those that have experience with the implementation and management of them.
- UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and other existing grievance mechanisms at the project, company, sector, national, regional and intergovernmental levels.
- Written communication skills with experience in producing formal documentation.
- Understanding of the Natural Rubber industry is desired, but not essential.

Travel is not expected for the engagement, but consultant may be asked to join Executive Committee meetings by phone from time to time.
Level of Effort

- The expectation is an engagement that will require significant effort to develop a structure and process of the Grievance Mechanism for the Platform for receiving, processing and hearing grievances.

- Regular contact and updating of both the Executive Committee and the Secretariat will be required.

- The decision to award a contract to a consultant shall be based on the level of experience and depth of proven knowledge they have and the assessment of the Secretariat of the viability of the consultant’s ability to complete the deliverables.
Submission Guidelines & Requirements

The following submission guidelines & requirements apply to this Request for Proposal:

1. Proposals will only be accepted from individuals or firms with experience relevant to this project.
2. Examples of previous relevant work should be provided as well.
3. A technical proposal must be provided that is not more than 4 pages. This technical proposal must provide an overview of the proposed solution as well as resumes of all key personnel performing the work. In addition, the technical proposal should provide a proposed schedule and milestones, as applicable.
4. A price proposal must be provided that is not more than 1 pages. This price proposal should indicate the overall fixed price for the project as well as hourly rates and an estimated total number of days.
5. Proposals must be signed by a representative that is authorized to commit bidder’s company.
6. Proposals must be received prior to the 13th of December to be considered. Proposals should be submitted to stefano.savi@gpsnr.org for consideration.
7. GPSNR anticipates shortlisting at least two individuals or firms to have more in-depth discussions with and will make an award to one of these “down-selected” individuals or firms.
8. GPSNR reserves the right to amend the scope and budget of this RFP in order to get the most suitable consultant for each topic.
Project Timelines

Because of the need to have a Grievance Mechanism in place when the Assurance Model is approved, the development of the Grievance Mechanism must adhere to an aggressive schedule:

The Request for Proposal timeline is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals submitted by consultant to <a href="mailto:stefano.savi@gpsnr.org">stefano.savi@gpsnr.org</a></td>
<td>December 13, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Top Bidders / Notification to Unsuccessful Bidders</td>
<td>December 20, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Award / Notification to Unsuccessful Bidders</td>
<td>January 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I and Phase II</td>
<td>January 31, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to and discussion with GPSNR Executive Committee for feedback (via telephone)</td>
<td>February EC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>March 30, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget

The Platform is anticipating that a total budget of no more than $10,000 USD be allocated to this engagement with an additional amount available to support approved travel, if necessary.

Payment terms shall be:

- 20% at the signing of the contract
- 30% at the midpoint date to be agreed upon and memorialized in the contract based on the submitted work plan
- 50% on delivery of the final report

The allocation of the payment shall be based on the net amount after travel expenses, if deemed necessary by both the consultant and Secretariat, are incurred and documented.

Evaluation Factors

GPSNR will rate proposals based on the following factors, with cost being the most important factor:
1. Responsiveness to the requirements set forth in this Request for Proposal;
2. Relevant past performance/experience;
3. Samples of work;
4. Cost, including an assessment of total cost of ownership;
5. Technical expertise/experience of bidder and bidder’s staff;

GPSNR reserves the right to award to the bidder that presents the best value to GPSNR as determined solely by GPSNR in its absolute discretion.
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